

**CITY OF TRAVERSE CITY  
MASTER PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, November 12, 2014**

**2:00 p.m.**

**Planning and Engineering Conference Room  
Governmental Center, 2nd Floor  
400 Boardman Avenue  
Traverse City, Michigan 49684**

**Posted 11/4/14**

**AGENDA**

The City of Traverse City does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to or treatment or employment in, its programs or activities. Penny Hill, Assistant City Manager, 400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, Michigan 49684, 922-4440, T.D.D., 922-4766, has been designated to coordinate compliance with the non-discrimination requirements. If you are planning to attend and you have a disability requiring any special assistance at the meeting and/or if you have any concerns, please immediately notify the ADA Coordinator.

Planning Commission  
c/o Russell Soyring, Planning Director  
400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, MI 49684  
231-922-4778

- 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**
- 2. REVIEW DRAFT EDITS TO FUTURE LAND USE MAP (DISCUSSION)**
- 3. REVIEW DRAFT EDITS TO MASTER PLAN (DISCUSSION)**
- 4. SET CALENDAR FOR MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT ADOPTION (DISCUSSION)**
- 5. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- 6. ADJOURNMENT**

# Envisioning Our Future: TC Neighborhoods

This Master Plan defines "neighborhood" as more than a collection of buildings. The definition expands to embrace collections of complementary and compatible activities central to the well being of our citizens. This definition recognizes the culture that has developed in each neighborhood and the benefits of embracing the layers of life that will emerge from each culture. It provides for a full range of evolving activities, services, and lifestyles while honoring the traditions that have delivered us to this time and place.

Traverse City neighborhoods have followed a traditional pattern: Rural lands stood at the town's edge. Larger "estate lots" lined the neighborhood edges. The estate lots defined the edge of a town and intrinsically connected to the neighborhood. The bulk of the neighborhoods were single-family lots ranging from thirty to two hundred feet in width. The lots narrowed closer to the center of the community. The block structure became more rigid at the center and more fluid away from the center. The highest density areas were located near the center.

This Plan supports and honors that geography. In moving forward, it encourages a social (people-oriented) perspective—one that defines neighborhoods according to the nature and intensity of human activity within a given area.

Each neighborhood nurtures a degree of human activity, which can be measured according to four variables (known as H.A.M.E. standards): *intensity levels:*

**Hours:** the hours of operation of an activity within a neighborhood.

*Access*

**Auto:** all motorized and non-motorized traffic within a neighborhood including but not limited to automobiles, trucks, buses, pedestrians, and bicycles.

**Mass:** the intensity of the buildings or structures within a neighborhood as defined by area, land coverage, height, distance to property lines, access to light, or conversely, effects of shadow.

**Emissions:** by-products of activities that leave the property or neighborhood within which it is created, including, but not limited to, noise, dust, odors, smoke, and light. Each neighborhood has an expected background level of emissions related to those characteristics found to be a normal part of an existence within that neighborhood's context.

The Plan uses these variables as *guidelines for appropriate* practical and quantifiable standards of intensity. The *levels. guidelines* standards will be used for decision-making—for protecting and nurturing the unique culture of each neighborhood and for maintaining transition zones between neighborhoods. With these *guidelines* standards, decision-makers are not limited to geographic space as a sole criterion; they can also factor in the way people live within a particular space—what kinds of activities they want to encourage or limit. By focusing on the *guidelines* standards within a particular neighborhood type, decision-makers can become more receptive to uses that promote other goals within our neighborhoods (small neighborhood services that promote walkability, for example).

The Plan also acknowledges that intensity changes within each neighborhood—that intensity is naturally but not evenly distributed. The center or core of the neighborhood tends to be the most pure to the neighborhood type. The Plan acknowledges this distribution and allows for the transition from one neighborhood type to another. Higher intensities will be allowed at the periphery of residential neighborhoods than what is allowed in their interior. Lower intensities will be encouraged at the periphery of commercial neighborhoods than what is allowed at their interior. This protects residential neighborhoods by creating a transition zone between high-intensity commercial activity and low-intensity domestic life.

**This Plan confronts the reality that each neighborhood shares a boundary with several others—with other kinds and degrees of activity. No neighborhood is an island. Therefore, a practical, clear-headed discussion of those boundaries is crucial to the overall health of the community. That discussion must transcend any one neighborhood but include them all.**

To begin the discussion, this Plan defines neighborhoods in ascending order of intensity (from least to most). The least intense neighborhood, TC-1 Conservation, has low levels of noise and a low acceptance of formal urban structures while the most intense, TC-5 Downtown, has high levels of noise and formal urban structures. If the area is residential, then the center has the least intensity ~~in~~ <sup>land</sup> ~~terms of H.A.M.E.~~ for that neighborhood type. If the area is commercial, then the center has the most intensity for the neighborhood type. The boundary areas become blended where similar neighborhood types meet, for example: where TC-2 Conventional meets TC-3 Traditional or where TC-4 Corridor meets TC-5 Downtown. These areas may have traits of each neighborhood type.

The boundaries between residential neighborhood types and commercial neighborhood types are hard: between TC-2 Conventional and TC-4 Corridor or between TC-3 Traditional and TC-5 Downtown. The commercial neighborhoods at the boundaries are expected to mitigate their intensity level to one that is no higher than the highest accepted intensity level of the adjoining residential neighborhood.

Needed? or update

# Acknowledgements

July 15, 2009

## City Commission (at adoption)

Michael Estes, Mayor  
Chris Bzdok, Mayor Pro Tem  
Jody A. Bergman  
Barbara D. Budros  
Jim Carruthers  
Denise Scrudato  
Ralph Soffredine

## Planning Commission (at adoption)

Fred Wilmeth, Chairperson  
Jennifer Jaffe, Vice-Chairperson  
Jody A. Bergman, City Commission Representative  
Michael Estes, Mayor  
Ross Richardson  
John Serratelli  
Robert Stow, Secretary  
Bill Twietmeyer, City Staff Representative  
Jan Warren

## Master Plan Committee

Jody A. Bergman, City Commission Representative  
Barbara D. Budros, City Commission Representative  
Chris Bzdok, City Commission Representative  
Debra Chavez, City Staff Representative  
Robert Stow, Planning Commission Representative  
Jan Warren, Planning Commission Representative  
Fred Wilmeth, Planning Commission Representative  
Jeanine Easterday, former Planning Commissioner  
Jason Eckerly, former Planning Commissioner  
David Hoekje, former Planning Commissioner

## City Staff (at adoption)

Russell Soyering, AICP, Planning Director  
David Weston, Zoning Administrator  
Kristie McCaw, Planning Assistant  
Kelli Springer, former Planning Assistant  
Tim Lodge, P.E., City Engineer  
Karrie Zeits, Esq., City Attorney

## Professional Resources

Dr. Johnathon Mauk,  
Northwestern Michigan College, Editor  
Jane Kowieski,  
Michigan Land Use Institute, Graphic Design  
Sarah Lucas, AICP, Reviewer  
Photos provided by Northwestern Michigan College,  
Michigan Land Use Institute, Rauth Photographic,  
R. Clark Associates, Inc., and the City of Traverse City.

# Resource Documents

*A New Agenda for Michigan. Michigan Future Inc.  
June 2006.*

*Across Grandview Parkway: Strengthening Connections  
Between Downtown and the Bay. University of  
Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment  
and the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban  
Planning. April 2006.*

*Burlington Municipal Development Plan, 2006.*

*Land Use Plan, Albermarle County Land Use Plan.  
July 2002.*

*Michigan Planning Act, March 2008.*

*Smart Code & Manual, v.8.0, New Urban Publications.*

*Smart Growth Audit. Grand Traverse County, Traverse  
City and Peninsula Township. Smart Growth Leadership  
Institute. 2006.*

*Traverse City Master Plan. Revised May 2002.*

*Visioning TC, William McDonough & Partners.  
October 2004.*

*Your Bay Your Say. Traverse City's Waterfront Plan.  
Accepted by the Bayfront Planning Committee on  
September 13, 2007.*

*Bayfront 2010 Plan*

*Master Plan*